

3 4 0686.7

U S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION IV, ATHENS, GEORGIA

34
A.R.

MEMORANDUM

SOUTH
SUPERFUND
Aug 28 1 19 PM '91

3744

DATE: **AUG 27 1991**

SUBJECT: Remedial Investigation, Field Technical Audit
Olin Corporation, McIntosh Plant,
McIntosh, Washington County, Alabama;
ESD Project No. 91E-625

FROM: *for* Roger E. Carlton, Environmental Engineer
Hazardous Waste Section
Environmental Compliance Branch
Environmental Services Division

TO: Cheryl W. Smith, RPM
AL/GA/MS Remedial Section
South Superfund Remedial Branch
Waste Management Division

THRU: William R. Bokey, Chief
Hazardous Waste Section
Environmental Compliance Branch
Environmental Services Division

William R. Bokey

A field technical system audit of an oversight contractor was conducted at the Olin Corporation/McIntosh Superfund Site located in McIntosh, Alabama during the week of August 19, 1991. There were no discrepancies that would adversely affect the integrity of the project detected during this audit. A complete check list is included.

If you have any questions, contact me at (404) 546-3351 or (FTS) 250-3351.

cc: Bokey/Hall
Knight

EPA, REGION IV, ESD
CONTRACTOR OVERVIEWER - AUDIT CHECKLIST
(this checklist for overiewing contractors overiewing contractors)

3 4 06868

Overview Contractor Name PRC Environmental Management, Inc.

Address 260 Peachtree Street, Suite 950, Atlanta, GA 30303

Facility/Site Name Olin Corporation

Address Highway 43, McIntosh, Alabama

Facility Contact Toni Odom Phone No. (205)-944-2231

Facility Activities/Operations Chemical Manufacture

ESD Project No. 91E-631 EPA ID No. _____

Audit Personnel Roger E. Carlton Date August 20, 1991

Overview Contractor Project Leader Bertrand L. Thomas

Title Environmental Scientist Phone No. (404)- 522-2867

Sampling Personnel/Affiliation Mike Schwartz, James Lemoine, Mark Pepper and
Chip McCloud of Woodward Clyde Consultants, 2822 O'Neal Lane, Baton Rouge, LA

Other Personnel & Affiliation _____

CONTRACTOR OVERVIEWER - AUDIT CHECKLIST

3 4 06869

Type of study? Remedial Investigation

Was a Study plan/Work Plan issued? Yes

Date issued? _____

Was the Study plan/Work plan reviewed by ESD? Yes X No _____

Was The Study plan/Work plan Acceptable? Yes X No _____

Was the Study plan/Work plan reviewed by overviewer? Yes X No _____

Was study plan followed? Yes X No _____

Comments _____

Was a safety plan prepared for the study? Yes X No _____

Did the overviewer review the safety plan? Yes X No _____

Was the safety plan was adequate? Yes X No _____

Was safety plan followed? Yes X No _____

Comments _____

Did the overviewer have his own safety plan Yes _____ No X

Did the overviewer have a copy of ESD's SOP on-site Yes _____ No X

Was the overviewer familiar with ESD's SOP Yes X No _____

Additional Comments or Information I felt that Bertrand needed to review the SOP and be more familiar with some of the finer details.

CONTRACTOR OVERVIEWER - AUDIT CHECKLIST

- 1) Was a field overview checklist completed Yes _____ No X
Comments _____
- 2) Was overviewer familiar with the facility and its operations? Yes X No _____
Comments _____
- 3) Was overviewer trained in equipment handling and proper sampling techniques? Yes X No _____
Comments _____
- 4) Did overviewer observe calibration of safety monitoring and/or field measurement equipment? Yes _____ No X
Comments None used during this phase.
- 5) Did overviewer observe all phases of the field investigation? (Sampling, field measurements, record keeping, packing and shipping samples, etc.) Yes X No _____
Comments _____

- 6) Did overviewer advise sampling personnel regarding improper procedures or practices whenever they were observed? Yes X No _____
Comments On one occassion the contractor ignored Bertrands suggestion and then ignored mine.
- 7) Did overviewer assist with the sampling, equipment decontamination or any other phase of the investigation? Yes _____ No X
Comments _____

- 8) Were there improper procedures or practices used which the overviewer failed to recognize? Yes X No _____
- 9) Was sampling conducted in accordance with standard operating procedures specified by EPA? Yes _____ No X
- 10) Was equipment decontamination conducted in accordance with standard operating procedures specified by EPA? Yes _____ No X
- 11) List any problem areas observed relative to question #8, #9 or #10.
8. The use of technical grade isopropynol
9. The auger extension was not changed, nor
10. was it field cleaned. I did not observe any field cleaning.

CONTRACTOR OVERVIEWER - AUDIT CHECKLIST

- 12) What are the qualifications of the investigative/sampling personnel (training and experience) by names?
All investigative personnel had training relivant to field sampling.
Personnel Protection and Safety, 1st aid and CPR plus several in-house
type training courses.
- 13) Have personnel received training in sampling techniques and equipment handling? Yes X No
Comments In-House and OJT
- 14) When was the latest training received and by whom was it provided?

- 15) What type of samples were collected? Soil/Sediment
- 16) For what analyses were the samples collected? TCL/TAL and nutrients

- 17) Were adequate field records kept in a bound log book? Yes X No
Comments _____

- 18) Did the overviewer take photographs and maintain a log? Yes X No
Comments _____
- 19) Have personnel received appropriate safety training? Yes X No
Comments _____
- 20) Do personnel undergo periodic refresher safety training? Yes X No
Comments _____
- 21) Did personnel have appropriate safety equipment for the investigation? Yes X No
Comments _____
- 22) Are personnel classified as to the type of investigations they can conduct? Yes No X
Comments _____
- 23) Have personnel had comprehensive physicals? Yes X No
Comments _____

- Comments** _____

- Overall, all parties involved appear to know what is required. I pointed out that more care should be exercised during stream sediment sampling.

Other comments or observations